UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,032	12/31/2003	Timothy W. Vanderveen	59429	9236
24201 FULWIDER PA	7590 07/29/200 ATTON LLP	EXAMINER		
	GHES CENTER	RAJ, RAJIV J		
6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)		
			750,032	VANDERVEEN,	VANDERVEEN, TIMOTHY W.	
Office Action Summary		Exa	miner	Art Unit		
		RAJ	IV J. RAJ	3626		
The M. Period for Reply	AILING DATE of this commu	nication appears	on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence a	ddress	
A SHORTENI WHICHEVER - Extensions of tin after SIX (6) MO - If NO period for - Failure to reply v Any reply receive	ED STATUTORY PERIOD F IS LONGER, FROM THE Note may be available under the provision NTHS from the mailing date of this come reply is specified above, the maximum syithin the set or extended period for replaced by the Office later than three months rm adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE ( s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). I munication. statutory period will appl y will, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUN n no event, however, may a y and will expire SIX (6) MO the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·	
Status						
2a) ☐ This ac 3) ☐ Since th	sive to communication(s) file tion is <b>FINAL</b> .  In accordance with the pract	2b)⊠ This action for allowance e	n is non-final. xcept for formal mat	· •	ne merits is	
Disposition of C	laims					
4a) Of the first section 4a) Of the first section for the first section 4a) □ Claim(section 8) □ Claim(section Paper 9) □ The spection 10) □ The drawn section for the first se	a) 1-24 is/are pending in the ne above claim(s) is/a is/are allowed. b) 1-24 is/are rejected. c) 1-24 is/are rejected. c) is/are objected to. c) are subject to restribute sers cification is objected to by the wing(s) filed on 31 December to may not request that any objected to be is/are pending.	are withdrawn fro ction and/or elec ne Examiner. er 2003 is/are: a	tion requirement. )⊠ accepted or b)[		miner.	
	ment drawing sheet(s) includin	_	,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '	
,—	า or declaration is objected t	to by the Examin	er. Note the attache	d Office Action or form P	10-152.	
a) All I 1. C 2. C 3. C	ledgment is made of a claim op Some * c) None of: Sertified copies of the priority copies of the certified copies of the priority copies of the certified copies pplication from the International detailed Office action	or documents have documents have sof the priority document documen	e been received. e been received in <i>i</i> ocuments have beer T Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this Nationa	ıl Stage	
<ul><li>2)  Notice of Drafts</li><li>3)  Information Dis</li></ul>	ences Cited (PTO-892) sperson's Patent Drawing Review ( closure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) ail Date <u>31 December 2003, 14 No</u>	·	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 		



Application No.

Application/Control Number: 10/750,032

Page 2

Art Unit: 3626

Art Unit: 3626

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Status of Claims

- 1. This action is in reply to the application filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending and have been examined.

# **Information Disclosure Statement**

3. The Information Disclosure Statements filed 31 December 2003, 14 November 2005, & 12 February 2007 have been considered. Initialed copies of the Form 1449 are enclosed herewith.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 3626

5. Claims 17 & 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a method/process claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) (see at least Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (see at least Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method/process claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here claims 17 & 20-24 fail to meet the above requirements because they are not tied to another statutory class of invention. Nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72. As Comiskey recognized, "the mere use of the machine to collect data necessary for application of the mental process may not make the claim patentable subject matter." Comiskey, 499 F.3d at 1380 (citing In re Grams, 888 F.2d 835, 839-40 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Incidental physical limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, and post-solution activity are not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process. In other words, nominal or token recitations of structure in a method claim do not convert an otherwise ineligible claim into an eligible one.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3626

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claims 1-7, 9-21, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlotterbeck et al. (US 2004/0128162 A1) (hereinafter Schlotterbeck) in view of Allen, III (US 4731726) (hereinafter Allen).
- 9. **Examiner's Note**: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

#### Claim 1

Schlotterbeck as shown discloses the following limitations:

- the medication administration information including a plurality of medication administration parameters and a parameter value associated with each medication administration parameter; (see at least Schlotterbeck [0017])
- a database operatively connected to the central processor for storing medication administration guidelines representing acceptable values for the medication administration parameters; (see at least Schlotterbeck [0036])
- means for communicating medication administration information from each of the medication administration devices to the central processor; (see at least Schlotterbeck Fig:2 Items:110-116 & related text)
- wherein the central processor is further configured to compare the parameter values to the acceptable values for the parameters in the medication administration guidelines (see at least Schlotterbeck [0039])

Schlotterbeck does not disclose the following limitations, however Allen, as shown does:

Art Unit: 3626

a memory associated with each medication administration device for storing medication

administration information associated with the medication delivered to each patient, (see

at least Allen Fig:2 Items:150-154 & related text)

a central processor configured to receive medication administration information from

each of the medication administration devices; (see at least Allen Fig:4 Items:10, 102-106

& related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Schlotterbeck

with the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 2

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Allen further

discloses the following limitations:

a central computer display operatively connected to the central processor (see at least

Allen Fig:4 Items:10, 102-106 & related text)

the central processor is further configured to display the medication administration

information on the central computer display (see at least Allen Fig:1 Items:12 fig:2 &

related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Schlotterbeck

with the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 3

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 2. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

 the central processor is further configured to provide a visual indication on the central computer display if one of the parameter values does not fall within the acceptable values for the parameter in the corresponding medication administration guideline (see at least Schlotterbeck [0067])

#### Claim 4

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 2. Schlotterbeck further discloses the following limitation:

the central computer display is located in a pharmacy (see at least Schlotterbeck Fig:1
 Items:32,36 & related text)

#### Claim 5

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 3. Allen further discloses the following limitations:

• means for a clinician to adjust the medication administration parameter values in response to the visual indication (see at least Allen Column:6 Lines:45-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1 Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

#### Claim 6

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 5. Allen further discloses the following limitations:

means for the clinician to report to a caregiver at the point of care the adjusted
 medication administration parameter values (see at least Allen Column:2 Lines:40-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

Art Unit: 3626

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 7

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

• the central processor is further configured to automatically adjust the medication

administration parameter values in response to an indication that one of the parameter

values does not fall within the acceptable values for the parameter in the corresponding

medication administration guideline (see at least Schlotterbeck Claim:9)

Claim 9

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 2. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

means for communication between a caregiver located at one of the medication

administration devices and a clinician located at the central computer display (see at

least Schlotterbeck Fig:2 Items:100,112,114 & related text)

Claim 10

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

the medication administration parameters include current medication administration

device operating parameters (see at least Schlotterbeck [0044])

Claim 11

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

the medication administration guidelines include the acceptable values for the medication

administration parameters based on patient condition data (see at least Schlotterbeck

[0036])

Claim 12

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 11. Schlotterbeck further discloses the following limitations:

 a memory operatively connected to the central processor for storing patient condition data associated with each patient; (see at least Schlotterbeck [0037] & [0038])

wherein the processor is further configured to compare the parameter values to the
acceptable values for the parameters in the medication administration guidelines
corresponding to the stored patient condition data associated with each patient (see at
least Schlotterbeck Claim:1)

#### Claim 13

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 12. Schlotterbeck further discloses the following limitation:

 the patient condition data for each patient includes current physiological status (see at least Schlotterbeck [0044])

### Claim 14

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Schlotterbeck further discloses the following limitation:

 the medication administration guidelines include the acceptable values for the medication administration parameters based on medication indication data (see at least Schlotterbeck [0036])

#### Claim 15

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Schlotterbeck further discloses the following limitations:

a memory in which is stored medication order information for a plurality of patients, the
medication order information including a plurality of prescribed medication administration
parameters for delivering medication to each patient and a parameter value associated
with each prescribed medication administration parameter; (see at least Schlotterbeck
[0017])

Art Unit: 3626

wherein the processor is further configured to compare the parameter values of the

prescribed medication administration parameters to the acceptable values for the

medication administration parameters in the medication administration guideline (see at

least Schlotterbeck [0039])

Claim 16

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 15. Allen further

discloses the following limitation:

a central computer display operatively connected to the central processor and wherein

the central processor is further configured to display the medication order information and

the medication administration information on the central computer display (see at least

Allen Fig:1 Items:12,14, Fig:2 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with

the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 17

Schlotterbeck as shown discloses the following limitations:

• the medication administration information including a plurality of medication

administration parameters and a parameter value associated with each medication

administration parameter; (see at least Schlotterbeck [0036])

storing a database of medication administration guidelines representing acceptable

values for the medication administration parameters; (see at least Schlotterbeck [0036])

communicating the medication administration information and the medication

administration guidelines to a central location; (see at least Schlotterbeck Fig:2

Items:110-116 & related text)

Art Unit: 3626

• comparing the parameter values to the acceptable values for the parameters in the

medication administration guidelines; (see at least Schlotterbeck [0039])

• providing an indication at the central location if one of the parameter values does not fall

within the acceptable values for the parameter in the corresponding medication

administration guideline (see at least Schlotterbeck [0067])

Schlotterbeck does not disclose the following limitations, however Allen, as shown does:

monitoring medication administration information associated with medication delivered to

each patient (see at least Allen Claim:1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with

the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 18

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 17. Allen further

discloses the following limitation:

displaying the medication administration information on a computer display at the central

location (see at least Allen Fig:1 Items:12 fig:2 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with

the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 19

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 18. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

Art Unit: 3626

providing an indication at the central location includes displaying an alert on the computer

display (see at least Schlotterbeck [0067])

Claim 20

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 17. Allen further

discloses the following limitation:

adjusting the medication administration parameter values from the central location in

response to the indication (see at least Allen Column:6 Lines:45-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with

the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 21

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 17. Allen further

discloses the following limitation:

communicating information from the central location to a care-giver located at the point of

care (see at least Allen Column:2 Lines:40-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Allen into

Schlotterbeck. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Schlotterbeck with

the motivation of providing an improved method and system for monitoring and adjusting

administration of medication for more effective patient healthcare. (see at least Allen Column:1

Lines:62-68 Column:2 Lines:1-15)

Claim 23

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 17. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

Art Unit: 3626

the medication administration guidelines include the acceptable values for the medication

administration parameters based on patient condition data (see at least Schlotterbeck

[0036])

Claim 24

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 17. Schlotterbeck

further discloses the following limitation:

the medication administration guidelines include the acceptable values for the medication

administration parameters based on medication indication data (see at least

Schlotterbeck [0036])

10. Claims 8 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlotterbeck in

view of Allen in further view of Kaufman et al. (US 5267174) (hereinafter Kaufman).

Claim 8

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Kaufman further

discloses the following limitation:

the central processor periodically compares the parameter values to the acceptable

values for the parameters in the medication administration guidelines throughout the

administration of the medication (see at least Kaufman Column:19 Lines:12-16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Kaufman into

Schlotterbeck/Allen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into

Schlotterbeck/Allen with the motivation to provide an adjustable and a more effective interactive

medication delivery device. (see at least Kaufman Column:2 Lines:15-28)

Claim 22

The combination of Schlotterbeck/Allen disclose all the limitations of claim 17. Kaufman further

discloses the following limitation:

Art Unit: 3626

periodically comparing the parameter values to the acceptable values for the parameters

in the medication administration guidelines throughout the administration (see at least

Kaufman Column: 19 Lines: 12-16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Kaufman into

Schlotterbeck/Allen. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into

Schlotterbeck/Allen with the motivation to provide an adjustable and a more effective interactive

medication delivery device. (see at least Kaufman Column:2 Lines:15-28)

Conclusion

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or

earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Rajiv J. Raj whose telephone number is 571-

270-3930. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Luke Gilligan can be reached at

571.272.6770.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information

Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR

or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov >.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 3626

### Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to 571-273-8300.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the United States Patent and Trademark

# **Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

Date: 07/08/08

/Rajiv J Raj/ Patent Examiner Art Unit 3626

/Robert Morgan/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626